54/(18)

Previous references.

File No. 100 of 1903-04

1905

(III Police)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

PART B FOR February 1905

SUBJECT.

Petition of Subbanna (Subba Rao) late Police Constable of the Nanjangud Taluk

FILE No. 100 of 1903-04.

Petition of K. Subba Rao, late Police constable of the Nanjangud T

1	Petition, dated 13th June 1904, from K. Subba Rao. (A 1891) Prays for reinstatement, stating that he was unjustly dismissed fc. ——ppro-priation of Government money.
2	No. J. 2824, dated 30th June 1904, to the Inspector General of Police. Forwards the above for disposal or report if necessary.
3	From the same, letter No. 2229—251, dated 22nd October 1904. Explains the circumstances which led to the dismissal of the petitioner.
4	Endorsement No. J. 1419, dated 1st December 1904, to the petitioner. Informs that Government see no reason to interfere, as he was properly dismissed.
5	To the Inspector General of Police, No. J. 2274, dated 10th February 1905. Warns Inspector Nataraja Iyer for his carelessness in not having exercised greater scrutiny before attesting the entries in the pay bill which was prepared by constable Subba Rao (the petitioner), who had made fraudulent entries in it.

G. R. S.

G. R. S. 11] 1904.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Police)

NOTES.

J. File No. 100 of 03-04

FILE HEADING.

Petition of Subbanna (Subbadas) late Police Constable of the Nanjangud Taluk.

From

Subbanna ... the petitioner

No. - Dated - Received 13-6-04

Diary No. J 1891	Enclos -	Spare Copies. -	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays for re-instatement

Records 18/2/05

Sent 15.11.04

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subd to the Dewan thro' the 2nd Commissr.

(Sd) K.S.C.

22-6-04

2nd Cis remarks :- " Serious allegations are made in the petition. The I.G. of Police may be asked to enquire into the same & submit a report, if necessary "

(Sd) C. Madiah.

24-6-04

The I.G. has not enquired into these serious allegations

2/11/1904

NOTES—First sheet.

MGC PB—25,000—16-8-03

V

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. /00 of 1903 – 4,

Serial No.

2" I think that we might have sent the petition to the Inspector General of Police for disposal, the matter not having been before him. We may do so now and when the petitioner comes with that officer's endorsement, We may then submit the matter to the Dewan Sahib thro' the Councils Concerned. Please draft a docket accordingly" (Sd) B. K.V. 24-6-04

Draft as directed above is submitted

28/6/04

28.6.04

2. Office Memo: No. 2824/J dated the 30th June 1904 to the I.G. of Police in Mysore, forwarding the above petition for disposal or for report if necessary.

3. Letter No. 2229/251 dated the 22nd October 1904 from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore explaining the circumstances which

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

which led to the dismissal of the petitioner.

3 The petitioner is reported to have misappropriated Government money but there was no sufficient evidence to secure a conviction & hence he is reported to have been dismissed the service. Subd with a draft endorsement stating that Govt decline to interfere.

SW 1-11-04. RRL 1-11-04

4 The petition has not been referred; nor have the records been sent. Though the facts have been reported in a earlier letter, the head of the dept seems the best judge as to whether the man should be retained in service or not; and as he has written about the petn's guilt, it seems unnecessary to interfere with his action.

The draft Endt may be approved

Lee 1-11-04

5 The appellant Subbarao, a police constable (that was doing the duty of clerk in the Tyrore Taluk police office) has been dismissed for having misappropriated some money drawn on account of the pay of another constable. The IG's

MGCPB—10,000—31-8-04.

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 1903-04

Serial No.

Report merely says that as the Report was convinced of the man's fault he dismissed him, as there was no evidence to prosecute him — & that on appeal the L.G confirmed the order. But details for the moral conviction are not given, nor has the record been sent. I do not know if on a mere statement of a suspect of his personal conviction a man may be dismissed & his appeals for investigation rejected. I therefore, beg leave to suggest that the man should be prosecuted as there may be evidence of having drawn the money and not paid it to the man that was entitled to get it.

Submitted to the Dewan Saheb thro the 2nd Councillor

2/11/1904

2-11-04

66 —
2-11-04. Why records may be sent for from Jamma Pandi and orders.

Note—Contn sheet.

MGCPB—10,600—31-8-04.

Sent for the record 5.11.1904

4/11/04

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. WD of 1903-04

Serial No.	
	Subt with a draft docket to the D.G. Calling for the records of the Case & the original petition of Subbanna. SW 9-11-04 RR 9-11-04 D Dne 9-11-04
—	Issued. No. J1178 dated the 10th November 1904
Diary no J1023 —	Letter No 2720/292 dated the 18th November 1904, forwarding the records of the Case as called for. Submitted for orders. The enquiry made goes to prove that the petitioner has misappropriated the money but the Supt. deferred to ~~take any criminal action~~ prosecute the man as the Police Inspector & the Amildar under whose signature the bill was drawn up would go in for a share of the blame. SW 21-11-04 RR 22-11-04 I The Supdt of Police Mysore District was of the opinion that if Subbaiah was prosecuted, the refund of his criminality would be a matter of doubt in a crim. Court & that he would get the benefit of it, while the conduct of the Inspector would be brought into question. He therefore suggested ~~that~~ the dismissal of the Constable and left the case to the Govt's disposal.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10,000 19-5-01

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 600 of 1903-04

Serial No.

9 We are here concerned only with the question of the punishment of dismissal inflicted on the pet^r. The records show that there can be little doubt that he did misappropriate the pay of an absent constable, but that the evidence which a Court of Justice would require to prove his guilt is not quite forthcoming. In such a case dismissal would seem to be a more appropriate punishment than a resort to a futile criminal prosecution.

10 The Deputy Comm^r's first note is in the file

To the DC^r

11 Under the petitioner's own admission of criminal misappropriation, does not admit of any doubt, but the question is whether the punishment of dismissal is adequate

Put up with the note

12/1
22/11/04

Note.—Contin. sheet.

MGCPB—10,000—31-8-04.

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 450 of 1903-04

Serial No.

The reasons given by the Inspector prosecuting the constables are inadmissible. The entries and alterations in the counterfoil pass-books contain the initials of Inspectors subordinate to the Inspector who is not the author of the entries initialled. It is not the Inspector's duty to countersign the entries initialled by the subordinate officers, but he should himself examine the entries and satisfy himself as to their correctness. The Inspector has therefore thought it proper to

MGCPB—10,000—31-8-04.

G.R.S. 12]

8

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. WO of 1903-04

Serial No.

I recommend the dismissal of the constable and the L.G. has accordingly dismissed him from service, withdrawing summons to a Criminal Court, & does not see any reason why his (L.G.'s) discretion should be questioned & that any decline to interfere with the order of dismissal

23/11/04

13 2986 I do not think that there are sufficient grounds for the Superintendent to refuse bail without any notice. The endorsement should be signed & I want a succinct statement of the case for the Superintendent

29.XI.04

29.11.04. 2985/26.11.04.

Issued & returned on 10-12-04 to the memo.

Issued 1.12.1904

Forward to for a memo 1.12.1904

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10,000—19-4-04

Memo Subsidiary directed

8. A.

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 1903 - 04

Serial No.	
4	Endorsement No 2 1419 dated 1.12.04 To the petitioner Informs that Govt see no reason to interpere, as he was, in their opinion properly dismissed

14 Probationary Inspector Natarajiyer was in temporary charge of the Mysore Taluk Police during the months of January and February 1903. At that time, one, constable Venkatasetty (according to his own statement) went on leave without pay from the 16th January 1903 and did not return till the 17th April ensuing. On his return he claimed his pay for the 15 days he had worked in January. The then Inspector (Md. Surajdeen) saw from the Baravard and registers that the pay had been disbursed to the constable, but the latter denied having either received the amount or having signed the baravard. On enquiry it was ascertained that one constable Subba Rao who was doing the duties of writer at the time had misappropriated the pay drawn in favor of the absent constable. The I. G. of Police ordered Subba Rao's dismissal, which the Government saw no reason to interfere with.

15 With regard to the Dewan's order requiring a succient statement of the case so far as it relates to the Inspector, it is submitted, that the pay-bill which is sent with the records shows-

(1) that a sum of Rs.5-10-4 was drawn for Venkatasetty from the 1st to the 25th January, and Rs.1-5-8 for the substitute Thimma (who cannot be found) from the 26th to the end of January;

(2) that the above figures are corrections, the original entries (which have been erased) seem to have been Rs.3-6-2,.and Rs.3-9-10, respectively;

(3) these corrections have not been attested by the Inspector; and

(4) the Inspector that has signed this Bill on the 11th February is not Natarajiyer, but Surajdeen.

The original office copy of the baravard has not been

Ex Reg V

forwarded. From the memo. submitted by the Superintendent and from the vernacular records of the case it appears that -

(1) Venkatasety's pay has been drawn from the 1st to the 24th of January and the pay of Thimma from the 25th to the 29th of that month.

(2) in the office copy of the pay-bill the entry of Rs.5-10-4 had been scored off and Rs.3-6-2 entered instead;

(3) all the corrections are attested by Inspector Natarajiyer; and that

(4) the original baravard has been signed by him.

(5) The memo. also mentions another substitute employed from the 29th January , but the pay-bill put up does not contain the corresponding entry.

16 The writer Subba Rao admits these facts, ~~but~~ but states that he made the entries under the verbal order of Inspector Natarajiyer. It may, perhaps, be presumed that the writer originally entered Rs.5-10-4 as being due to Venkatasetty, but afterwards corrected the same to Rs.3-6-2 and obtained the initials of the Probationary Inspector, and then in making the fair copy of the pay bill, first entered Rs.3-6-2 and after obtaining the signature of the then InspectorSurajdeen erased the figures and entered Rs.5-10-4 with the object of drawing the full amount in the name of the absent constable Venkatasetty.

17 Inspector Natarajiyer, however, seems answerable for his carelessness

(1) in having allowed Subba Rao to draw the pay of the absent constable; and

(2) in having attested a fraudulent entry without

× Flag IV

making any sort of enquiry. Natarajiye~~Varia~~ explanation × is that during the short time he was in charge it was not possible for him to acquaint himself with the details of his charge and that he ~~may~~ might have been misled especially as he was engaged in the detection of an important case of murder.

SP
24-1-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 1903-04

Serial No.

Inspector Natarajan does admit his carelessness and it does not appear that he was guilty of anything more serious. He may be censured for his negligence & warned. 2.i.1.'05

Submitted to the Diwan Sahib thro the 2d Councillor & 25.1.1905

Read 25-1-05. Let him submit the memo. Please submit, & inspect-or Natarajan does not deserve more severe punishment than a warning 27/1/05.

28/1/1905 20 9 do accordingly 4453 29.1.05 want & direct him severely whether the warning will have any good effect 1.II.05

Draft ord 3.2.1905

Subd with a draft order 21 3/2/05

SR 9/2/05

Note—Contn. sheet.

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 1903-04

Serial No.	
5	No 2274 dt 16 2 1904 To the Inspector General of Police Warns Inspector Natrajier for his carelessness ~~in not having noted verified the paybills~~ in not having exercised greater scrutiny before attesting the entries in the pay bill which was prepared by constable Subba Rao ~~and~~ who had made fraudulent entries in it.

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-04.

1904

No. 2774

Name of Petitioner: W. V. Subbarao. Police Constable No 90

Village: Nanjangood T.K

Taluk:

District: Mysore

Date of Arzi:

Date of Receipt: 13-6-04

Date of Disposal:

No. of Encloser:

Addressed to H. H. the Maharaja

ABSTRACT

States as follows:—

That as he did not agree to keep proportionately the amount spent by the Officers in dastoor for the Medical and Superintendent when they visited the Taluk, a charge was brought against the petr that he misappropriated Govt money and he has been suspended; that

Forwd No 3875 of 10/6/04 transferring the petn to the Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl Deptt for disposal

(Sd) P. Raghavendrachar
for Private Secretary

Transferred to the Judicial Branch.

24/6/04.

Where is the order complained against?

20/6/04

It is not filed.

Endorsement on Petitioner's application for perusal of the petition to Govt this 21/6/04

Memo allowing petr to make extracts from petition. The Govt Order may be made out in favour of petr and sent to Mysore Commissioner with a copy of petition

MGCPB—1000—17-5-04

petitioners request to prosecute
him has not been complied
with and that the above
charge was imposed on the
petitioners unjustly

Perhaps the matter be
enquired and the petitioner
reinstated.

WH
17/6/06

I think that we
might have sent the petition
to the D.G of Police for disposal
the matter not having
been before him. We
may do so now & when
the petitioner comes
with that officer's endorsement
we may then submit
the matter to the Diwan
Saheb that the Councillor
concerned. Please draft
a docket accordingly

24.6.'06

2.7.06

(Copy in continuation
note file)

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
18 JUN 1904
TO H H THE MAHARAJA

Mysore Government
General and Revenue Secretariat
Petition Department
Regd No. 2774/16-17
Date 13-6-1904

2774

ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೆ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನೆ

ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಳೆಯು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೀಳದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬೆಳೆಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನರು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಅಂಥಾ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅನೇಕ ಉಪಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಆ ಉಪಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಉಪಾಯಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಫಲಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೆಲವು ಉಪಾಯಗಳು ಫಲಕಾರಿಯಾಗದೆ ಇರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಉಪಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಉಪಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ಉಪಾಯವೇನೆಂದರೆ

ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಟ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನವಳು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿದೆ.
ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಈ ಯಂತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲ ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದು.
ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು
ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸಗಳ
ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಶ್ಚಯಿಸಿರುವೆವು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ
ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು
ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿರುವೆವು. ಈ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾದರೆ ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು
ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವೆವು. ಈ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾದರೆ
ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಯಸುವವರು ಕೂಡಲೆ ಬರೆದು
ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು
ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು
ಬಯಸುವವರು ಕೂಡಲೆ ಬರೆದು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ. ಈ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು
ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿರುವೆವು.
ಈ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾದರೆ

S Vol 2 5

Govt General
MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Revenue Secretariat
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No. 2824 of 30/6/04 Govt
E 1004 903-4

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2774
dated the 18th June 04 received at the
Secretariat
~~Dewan's Office~~ from K. V. Subbanna
Police Constable No 90
Nanjangud Taluk Complain-
-ing that he has been
unjustly suspended for
not agreeing to bear a
portion of the amount
spent by the Police Officers
on the occasion of the visit of
~~is forwarded, together with its~~
the Inspector Genl of Police to the
~~enclosures, to the~~
Police Supdt — is for-
-warded to the Inspector
General of Police for
disposal, as proposed
in Govt Memorandum

As Secy's order

By order,

Bangalore, for Secretary.

The 189

Typed
30/6/04

III
Draw
-24/6
(Police)

File No. 100 93-04
1904-05 J869
S. No. 3.

From.
The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To. The Secretary to the Govt.
of H. H. the Maharaja
of Mysore in the Genl
and Rev Depts.

Dated
Despatched 22-Augst
Received
General No. 2229/251
No.
Enclosure No.

Submitting a detailed
report regarding
the dismissal of
ex-Police Constable
Subbanna of Nanjan
Gud Taluk

File No. 1004 S.R.
Copy in Secret
dt. 31/10/04

7

No 2229
25/1

Office of the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore.
Dated Bangalore, 22 October 1904.

From,

F. E. b. Carr Esquire,
Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To,

B. K. Venkatavaradaerfar Esquire,
Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore in the General
and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Reference :-

Official Memorandum No
2824 dated 30th June 1904, forwarding
for report petition No 2774 dated 13th
June 1904 from Ex Police Constable Subbanna
of Nanjangud Taluk.

I have the honor to state that
the

the petitioner was a writer in the Kasaba Station, Mysore Taluk in 1903. Venkata Setty, a Second class Constable of the Taluk went on leave and the petitioner during his absence, drew the pay and misappropriated it. The Superintendent made a careful enquiry into the charge and recommended the dismissal of the petitioner. A Criminal prosecution was not instituted as the evidence was considered insufficient to secure a Conviction.

Subbanna the petitioner, was dismissed and the order of dismissal was confirmed in this Office memo No $\frac{1091}{87}$ dated $\frac{16}{22}$ August 1904, an extract from which is herein enclosed

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Inspector General of Police

No 1091/87

Office of the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore.
Dated, Bangalore, 16/22 August 1904.

Memorandum.

Read:-

Docket No 581 of the 14th March 1904, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, with the Superintendent's memo and other records connected with the misappropriation of a sum of Rs 5-10-4 by Constable Subba Rao, No 80 of the Mysore Taluk.

Order No 1091/87 Dated 22.8.1904.

The Writer Subba Rao will be dismissed as recommended by the Superintendent. The Constable has by his subsequent action shewn clearly

clearly that he misappropriated Government money.

× × × ×

(Signed). F. C. Carr
Inspector General of Police.

'Extract'

Inspector General of Police

4/76

G.R.S.—26]

Police (1)

File No. 100-3-04

Serial No. Ni

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. J 1178
Police 100 3 04

General and Rev. Secretariat
(Police)
, the 10/11/04 190 .

To

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore

Date of issue 10/11/04

Signed by Mr. K. S. Chandra-sekhara Aiyar

His. letter No. 2229/251 dated the 22nd October 1904, Submitting a detailed report regarding the dismissal of the Police Constable Subbanna of the Nanjangud Taluk.

Adverting to the above, has the honour to request that the original records connected with the case & the original petition forwarded with this Office Memorandum No. 2824 dated the 30th June 1904

over.

SUBJECT.

12 ditto
may be forwarded to this office
for reference

B 10
9/11/04
for Secretary

As per 1st Circulars

SN
9.11.04 · HRL
9.11.04

List of enclosures.

Copied by F.H.K. 9-11-04

Examined by WW 9-11-04

MGCPB—5,000—26-5-04

III Draw 1911 Police L 1023 13

1904-1905.

From,

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore in the Genl. and Rev. Depts.

Dated.

Despatched. 18th November 1904.

Received.

General No 2720/272

No

Enclosure No
File of records & a petn

Forwarding certain records & a petition connected with the case of Police Constable Subbanna of the Nanjangud Taluk.

1-B

No

Camp Office of the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore.
Dated, Dobbspet, 18th November 1904.

From,

F. E. de Barr Esquire,
Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To,

P. K. Venkatāvaradaiengar Esquire,
Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore in the General
and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Reference :-

Your docket No. 1178 / Police 100 of 03-04

dated the 10th instant calling for the
records connected with the dismissal
of

of Police Constable Subbamma of the Nanjangud Taluk.

— 4 —

I have the honor to forward herewith the Police Superintendent's Memo dated 5th March 1904 and the records connected with the case.

The petition received with your memorandum No 2824/9 dated 30th June 1904 is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

J C [illegible]

Inspector General of Police.

Encl. Copy received

No. J 1419
Police 100 [illegible]-04

Mysore Govt. Gen. & Rev. Secretariat,
Dated, Bangalore, 18th Dec: 190 04

Endorsement granted to K.V. Subba Rao, La
Police Constable of the Nanjangud Taluk
in reply to his Petition ~~Registered No.~~ dated the 13th
June 1904, appealing against the order of his dismiss

Petitioner is informed that Government see no reason
to interfere in the matter, as the Inquiry has been conducted [illegible]

Copy to the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, with reference to his letter No. 2229/251 dated the 22nd October 1904.

By Order,

Secretary.

29.11.04
1-11-04
1.12.1904
Secretary Copd. 1-12-04
Secretary Copd. 1-12-04

16

G.R.S. 28]

Police
File No. 100-B-01
Serial No. 5

Diary No. of letter replied to ——— ———

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(Police)

, *the* 10/01/ 1905

Date of issue 10/01/05

Signed by M.K.S. Chandra Shekhara Aiyar

READ.—

Correspondence ending with the letter No. 2720 dated the 18th November 1904, from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, submitting the records connected with the dismissal from service of Police

~~ORDER THEREON No.~~

Constable K. Subba Rao alias Subbanna of the Nanjangud Taluk.

Order thereon. No. J 2874 Police 100-01-03-04

The petitioner Subba Rao

SUBJECT

Rdo/ Police Constable, who was doing the duties of a writer in the Inspector's office, was dismissed from the service by the Inspector General of Police for having misappropriated a portion of the pay drawn in favour of another Constable who was absent on leave. On a perusal of the records of the case, it is observed that the Constable was no doubt guilty of misappropriation but that there was no sufficient evidence to convict him in a Court of justice, and that the Probs Inspector Nataraja Iyer who was in temporary charge of the Mysore Taluk during the period, has attested the fraudulent entries in the ~~for~~ office Copy of the Pay abstract prepared by the Constable. The Inspector Explains that he was in charge during the short time he was in charge of the Taluk it

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

was not possible for him to acquaint himself with all the details of the charge and that he might have been misled especially as he was engaged in the detection of an important case of murder. Govt Consider that Nataraja Iyer though quite new to the work ought to have exercised greater scrutiny and attended the entries after needful enquiry & verification. but that his conduct is in no way open to suspicion. In these circumstances they do not desire to inflict on him a more severe punishment than a warning for his carelessness, which the Inspector General is requested to communicate to the Inspector.

The Patitioner Subbarao has been informed that Govt See no reason to interfere with the order of dismissal passed against him

Secretary

Copied B.J. 10/2/05.
Examined. S.V. 10/2/05

S.V. 9/2/05

To The Inspector of Police in Mysore returning the records